State of California • Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor
State and Consumer Services Agency
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES
Executive Office
707 Third Street • West Sacramento, CA 95605 • (916) 376-5000 • Fax (916) 376-5018 • www.dgs.ca.gov

November 4, 2009

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Legislative Counsel
State Capitol, Room 3021, B-30
Sacramento, CA 95814

Dear Ms. Boyer-Vine:

Pursuant to the requirements of Education Code Sections 17319 and 81131.1, the Department of General Services (DGS) is submitting the Final Report, Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review.

In keeping with our commitment to encourage conservation, we have posted this report to our website. The report can be viewed at http://www.legi.dgs.ca.gov/Publications/2009LegislativeReports.htm. The report is entitled *Final Report, Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review.*

If you wish to receive a printed copy of this report, please contact Jill Jones, Project Manager, Division of the State Architect, Department of General Services, at (916) 324-7183.

Sincerely,

Ronald L. Diedrich
Acting Director

cc: See attached distribution list
Jill Jones, Project Manager, Division of the State Architect, Department of General Services

DISTRIBUTION #2
LEGISLATIVE REPORT LISTING

ORIGINAL LETTER TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:

Ms. Diane F. Boyer-Vine
Legislative Counsel
State Capitol, Room 3021, B-30
Sacramento, CA 95814
(1 original)

Mr. Gregory Palmer Schmidt
Secretary of the Senate
State Capitol, Room 3044, E-22
Sacramento, CA 95814
(1 original)

Mr. E. Dotson Wilson
Chief Clerk of the Assembly
State Capitol, Room 3196, E-24
Sacramento, CA 95814
(1 original)

COPY OF LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S LETTER TO EACH OF THE FOLLOWING:

Michael Prosio, Legislative Affairs Secretary
Office of the Governor
State Capitol, First Floor, E-15
Sacramento, CA 95814

Laura Zuniga, Acting Deputy Secretary, Legislation
State and Consumer Services Agency
915 Capitol Mall, Room 200, C-14
Sacramento, CA 95814

Todd Jerue, Program Budget Manager
Department of Finance
915 L Street, A-15
Sacramento, CA 95814

Karen Finn, Program Budget Manager
Department of Finance
915 L Street, A-15
Sacramento, CA 95814

Scott Harvey, Chief Deputy Director
Department of General Services
707 Third Street, 8th Floor, Z-1
West Sacramento, CA 95605

Mary Ann DeWitt, Budget and Planning Officer
Office of Fiscal Services
707 Third Street, 9th Floor, Z-1
West Sacramento, CA 95605

Lisa Martin, Acting Deputy Director–Legislative Affairs
Department of General Services
707 Third Street, 8th Floor, Z-1
West Sacramento, CA 95605

Office of Legislative Counsel
Attention: Indexing Division
925 L Street, Suite 1150, B-30
Sacramento, CA 95814

California State Library
Information Resources and Government Publications
914 Capitol Mall, E-29
Sacramento, CA 95814

Originating Office

LEGISLATURE--REVISED 07/31/09

Final Report

Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review

(AB 162, Chapter 407, Statutes of 2006)

July 2009

State of California
Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor

State and Consumer Services Agency
Fred Aguiar, Secretary

Department of General Services
Will Bush, Director
Will Semmes, Chief Deputy Director
Scott Harvey, Chief Deputy Director

Division of the State Architect
David Thorman, State Architect

Prepared by the

Division of the State Architect
1102 Q Street, Suite 5100
Sacramento, CA 95811
916.445.8100
www.dsa.dgs.ca.gov

Contents

Executive Summary 4

Background 7

Division of the State Architect 7

K-12 School and Community College Districts 8

Overview 9

Traditional Plan Review Process 9

Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review 10

Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review 12

Phase One Collaborative Process Implementation 12

Preliminary Design Meetings 12

DSA Organization and Staffing 13

Model Timeframe Goals 14

Training for DSA Staff and Plan Review Consultants 14

Phase Two Collaborative Process Implementation 15

Regulations, Policies, and Procedures 15

Tracking and Timeframe Commitments 15

Results 15

Attachment A—Excerpt from Assembly Bill 162 20

Attachment B—Senate Bill 588 28

Attachment C—Collaborative Process Implementation Letter 31

Attachment D—Model Timeframe Goals 33

Attachment E—Required Training Courses for DSA and Consultant Plan Review Staff 36

Attachment F—Glossary of Terms 37

Executive Summary

Assembly Bill 162, Chapter 407, Statutes of 2006,[1] effective January 2007, established a Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review available to K-12 school and community college districts on a voluntary basis. The legislation directed the Division of the State Architect (DSA) within the Department of General Services (DGS) to provide a preliminary report to the Legislature by July 1, 2008, and a final report by July 1, 2009, on whether the Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review has assisted the DSA, K-12 public school, and community college districts in meeting their mutually determined timeframe goals for project review and approval. This final report, dated July 2009, has been developed and submitted subsequent to the July 2008 preliminary report.

The Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review was established to ensure the public safety of K-12 and community college facilities through a collaborative, consistent, and timely project development and review process. This process is available on a voluntary basis to K-12 and community college districts as an alternative to the traditional plan review and approval process. The Collaborative Process requires the early participation and communication between all parties—DSA staff and their qualified plan review firms, and K-12 and community college districts and their design professionals are involved in a project from initial project development, design and plan review, and continues through construction, and certification for Field Act compliance of facilities projects.

Implementing the Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review is being accomplished in two phases. Whereas the preliminary report addressed the accomplishments of Phase One that included those informal processes that were undertaken prior to the formal adoption of written procedures, this final report describes the activities performed in Phase Two including the development of and planned adoption of administrative regulations, and implementation of formal written policies, processes, and procedures. The regulations will provide for collection of plan review fees prior to DSA project submittal and are planned for adoption in the 2009 rulemaking cycle led by the California Building Standards Commission. Also, DSA has engaged a consultant to perform an organizational assessment of all DSA processes including the Collaborative Process and potential modifications to the current plan review fee structure.

Adoption of these standards is slated for the 2009 rulemaking cycle governed by the California Building Standards Commission.

The Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review is intended to reduce the timeframes required for all elements of the plan review and approval process including the code compliance plan review, backcheck, and approval processes. The Collaborative Process supports the reductions of these timeframes through:

- Preliminary design meetings between DSA staff, and district staff and their design professionals. All parties agree on design concepts, code interpretations, and

[1] Excerpts of AB 162 (Leslie) are reprinted in Attachment A

project schedules during the earliest stages of a project's development. The DSA has historically participated in preliminary meetings upon district request. Under the Collaborative Process, these meetings are required and occur at set intervals during a project's design and development to facilitate increased accountability and process efficiencies.

- Cost estimate value engineering and constructability reviews by district representatives prior to submittal to the DSA to minimize the potential for changes to the project that must be re-reviewed by the DSA after the initial project review and thereby delaying project approvals.
- Quality assurance reviews of all project documents performed by the district's design professionals prior to submittal to the DSA for code compliance plan review.

The elements of the Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review identified above are intended to ensure that documents submitted to the DSA are more complete and code compliant and therefore less likely to need further revisions and corrections prior to receiving DSA approval and changes during construction. Implementing of these elements is intended to reduce the amount of time required for a construction project to receive DSA approval. However, the actual time savings is dependent on the number and significance of issues identified and resolved prior to submittal to DSA for project review. The timeframe for the district's design professional to respond to DSA code compliance plan review comments and complete the backcheck is outside of DSA control. This timeframe may be substantially longer than the DSA code compliance plan review timeframe and may contribute to a project's delay.

In all, 43 projects were identified beginning July 1, 2008, as utilizing the Collaborative Process. The results demonstrate that DSA plan review was completed on or prior to the timeframe goal for 67 percent of the projects. The timeframe goal was not met for 33 percent of the projects. Backcheck was completed by the districts/design professionals for 18 of the projects. Of these, approximately 25 percent of the projects completed backcheck prior to the timeframe goal and 72 percent the projects did not meet the timeframe goal. The backcheck process is initiated upon completion of the DSA plan review. The project design professional prepares responses to the plan review comments and schedules a backcheck appointment with DSA plan reviewers. This face-to-face backcheck meeting is conducted between the district and its project design professional and DSA plan reviewers to resolve all plan review comments.

In addition, an analysis was conducted comparing the average number of days for DSA plan review, and district/design professional response to comments and backcheck for projects using the Collaborative Process and projects utilizing the traditional plan review process. Again, early results demonstrate reductions in timeframes for DSA plan review and district/design professional response to comments and backcheck.

Finally, 215 preliminary design meetings, a key element of the Collaborative Process, were conducted from July 1, 2008, through March 31, 2009, for the 43 Collaborative Process projects. Twelve (12) K-12 districts and 10 community college districts and their design teams have participated in these preliminary design meetings for projects totaling nearly $744 million in estimated construction costs.

Background

The Field Act[2] was enacted following a severe earthquake in Long Beach in 1933 that damaged several schools. Soon thereafter, California law established structural standards and a comprehensive design specification and construction oversight process for public K-12 schools and community colleges. The purposes of the standards are to enhance the structural, life and fire safety protection for people in a school or community college building during an earthquake, and to increase the likelihood that the buildings can serve as evacuation centers following an earthquake.

Among other activities, the Field Act requires the DSA to review construction plans for K-12 public school and community college buildings, and requires districts to hire onsite construction inspectors to ensure compliance with structural safety standards. Other public buildings, including buildings for the University of California and the California State University, must comply with the standards set forth in the California Building Standards Code (CBC).[3]

There are significant differences in the enforcement of building standards under the Field Act as compared to the CBC. Under the Field Act, a qualified structural engineer or architect must review and approve project construction plans and specifications. The Field Act also requires an inspector who has been certified by the DSA to continuously inspect the project during the construction phase to verify compliance with the structural safety standards embodied in the approved plans. The CBC is enforced by local building code officials.

Division of the State Architect (DSA)

The DSA approves the design and supervises construction of K-12 and community college buildings to ensure that facilities are safe and accessible. The DSA reviews construction plans for structural safety, fire and life safety, and access compliance to verify project plans meet the requirements of the California Building Code. The DSA also provides construction oversight to these projects to ensure they are built in accordance with the approved plans. In addition, DSA provides an access compliance review for all State funded public buildings.

For the past five fiscal years, DSA has annually reviewed, on average, 2,546 K-12 building projects with an estimated construction cost of $4.5 billion, 230 community college projects with an estimated cost of $0.9 billion and 466 State-funded public projects for access compliance only with an estimated cost of $1.4 billion. For the 2007-08 Fiscal Year, DSA reviewed 2,862 K-12 projects with an estimated cost of $4.3 billion and 318 community college projects with an estimated cost of $1.9 billion. For the 2008-09 Fiscal Year through March 31, 2009, DSA reviewed 1,682 K-12 projects with an estimated cost of $3.3 billion and 195 community college projects with an estimated cost of $1.1 billion.

---

[2] Chapter 59, Statutes of 1933 (AB 2342)

[3] In general, buildings constructed according to the CBC are designed to withstand an earthquake to allow the occupants to exit safely. Buildings constructed to Field Act standards are designed to withstand an earthquake so that the occupants may exit safely and for the building to remain usable.

The DSA consists of a headquarters office in Sacramento and four regional offices located in Oakland, Sacramento, Los Angeles, and San Diego. Satellite offices that serve as extensions of the regional offices are located in Riverside and Bakersfield. The DSA regional offices conduct project plan review, construction oversight, and project close-out activities. The DSA headquarters office develops and administers statewide programs, including but not limited to technical training, building code development, and inspector and laboratory certification.

To ensure safe and accessible schools, DSA also reviews and promulgates building codes and writes interpretations to clarify ambiguous regulations for K-12 and community college construction projects. In addition, DSA tests and certifies project inspectors and testing laboratories to provide an adequate pool of inspectors and laboratories from which districts can select and employ to provide inspection and testing services for their projects. The DSA also contracts with qualified plan review firms that augment DSA staff to ensure adequate plan review resources are available to provide timely plan review during periods of high workload volumes. Additionally, DSA staff presents information regarding DSA processes, procedures, and interpretations at numerous conferences and meetings attended by school and community college district personnel, design professionals, inspectors, and testing laboratory personnel.

K-12 Public School and Community College Districts

The K-12 or community college district's role in the project construction process consists of planning and overall management of the project, hiring a design professional to design and prepare construction plans for the project, and for the construction phase hiring a DSA-approved project inspector and a DSA-certified testing laboratory. The district also hires the contractor responsible for constructing the facilities. District staff is responsible for monitoring the performance of all contracted parties including the project's design professionals to ensure completion of all design and construction requirements.

Overview

Traditional Plan Review Process

Under the provisions of the Education Code (EC) and Title 24 Regulations, DSA conducts thorough plan review of project plans and specifications. The traditional process is performed after the design of the project has been completed and submitted to DSA by the project design professionals. At a district's request, DSA is occasionally involved in the project design development during preliminary design meetings. The traditional plan review process is composed of the following activities:

- The project design professional performs design functions with the client and completes construction documents.
- The design professional submits construction documents, fees, and geological reports to DSA for code compliance review.
- The DSA assigns a project application number and performs an intake evaluation for completeness and correctness of the construction documents. If the plan submittal is determined to be incomplete, DSA notifies the design professional of the required documentation and the project is placed on hold until the submittal is complete enough to begin plan review.
- The DSA plan review engineers, architects, and fire and life safety officers perform their respective review and return the plan review check sets with comments to the project design professional upon completion.
- The project design professionals prepare responses to the DSA plan check comments and schedule a backcheck appointment with DSA plan reviewers.
- A face-to-face backcheck meeting is conducted between the project design professional and DSA plan reviewers to resolve all plan review comments. The project owner is rarely present during backcheck meetings. Depending upon the significance and number of plan review comments, the plan review and backcheck steps may require several cycles to resolve all comments.
- Upon resolution of all comments, project plans and specifications are stamped and approved by DSA.

The length of time necessary to complete a plan review from submittal to approval is dependent upon the project size, scope and complexity, completeness and correctness of the construction documents submitted to DSA by the project design professional, availability of the DSA plan review staff and DSA plan review consultants, duration of plan review, the number of cycles needed to complete the review, and the duration between return of the plan check sets to the design professional for corrections and the backcheck appointment(s) with DSA. The DSA plan review consultants are utilized to augment the DSA plan review staff when needed, and project supervision and training are ongoing to improve efficiency and timeliness of plan reviews.

Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review

The Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review is an alternative process to the existing plan review and approval process for K-12 and community college projects for the purpose of providing collaborative, consistent and timely project development, and review. Districts may volunteer to have their projects, on a project-specific basis, included in the Collaborative Process, subject to authorization by DSA. The process is intended to provide mutual benefits to the districts, design professionals, and DSA. A comparison between the traditional and Collaborative Process plan review processes is described in Chart 1 below.

Chart 1. Comparison between Traditional and Collaborative Plan Review Processes

Key Element	Traditional Process	Collaborative Process
Preliminary design meetings during design development to establish project design criteria	Occasional	Required
K-12 and community college district representative participation during design development in preliminary design meetings	Occasional	Required
Mutual agreement between all involved parties early in design development on submittal and plan review timeframes	Occasional	Required
Qualified DSA plan review consultant participation in preliminary design meetings	None	At District Discretion
Cost estimate validation by district at 50 percent completion of construction documents	None	Required
Value engineering/constructability reviews conducted by district at 50 percent completion of construction documents	None	Required
Incorporation of cost estimate and value engineering/constructability review recommendations prior to DSA plan submittal	None	Required
Quality assurance reviews conducted by architect/engineer prior to submittal to DSA	Occasional	Required
Intake review conducted by DSA	Required	Required—anticipate time reduction
DSA plan review performed and comments provided to architect	Required	Required—potential time reduction dependent on project submittal quality
Corrections made by architect in response to DSA plan review comments	Required	Required—potential time reduction dependent on project submittal quality
Backcheck and DSA approval	Required	Required—anticipate reduced timeframe
Additional plan review and backcheck cycles	Occasional	Reduced—anticipate reduction and possible elimination of multiple cycles

Formal written policies, processes, and procedures have been developed and implemented and have provided districts with the ability to develop construction schedules with established dates and timeframes and to minimize if not eliminate significant delays due to code compliance issues during the plan review process. These policies and procedures also provide DSA with the increased assurance of complete and accurate project submittals for plan review and reduction of significant changes to the design during plan review and construction as a result of code compliance, cost, or constructability issues. Early results signify that these improvements result in a reduced timeframe for plan review and continue through the time needed to achieve project approval.

Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review

The Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review was implemented in two phases. Phase One consisted of aspects of the legislation that could be implemented by establishing informal internal DSA policies, processes, and procedures. Phase Two included the development of formal written policies, processes, and procedures, and tracking mutually agreed upon timeframe goal commitments between DSA, the districts and their design professionals.

Phase One Collaborative Process Implementation

On November 3, 2006, DSA issued a letter to the California Community College Chief Business Officers and Facilities Planners announcing that the initial phase of the Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review would begin in January 2007 (Attachment C). At the same time, DSA also made this process available to all elementary and secondary public school districts and announced the program at numerous facilities planners' meetings and conferences throughout the State. The process was made available to districts subject to DSA approval on a project-specific basis for projects with an estimated cost of construction exceeding $5 million.

The following activities were accomplished in Phase One:

Preliminary Design Meetings

Interested districts or their designated facilities representatives make their request to DSA for approval to participate in the Collaborative Process for a specific project early in the design process. The DSA schedules preliminary design meetings with the district representative and the project design team at the start of design development and at near completion of the construction documents in order to:

- Identify and resolve technical issues that may adversely affect the technical design and cause delays during the plan review process. Additional meetings may be scheduled as necessary based on the complexity of the project.
- Review project submittal requirements to ensure more complete and accurate project submittals to DSA to expedite the submittal and review processes.
- Determine mutually agreed upon timeframes for project submittal, return of DSA plan review results to the design team, start of the project backcheck, and project approval.
- Document discussions and agreements.

The district representative actively participates in the preliminary design meetings to engage in the project decision-making process and establishing of timeframe goals. The design team records all meeting discussion points, agreements, and timeframe milestones and distributes a meeting record to all parties. The records of these meetings are provided to the DSA project plan reviewers.

The DSA staff attending the preliminary design meetings typically include a Supervising Architect, Supervising Structural Engineer, Lead Fire & Life Safety Officer, and Intake Architect. These staff are technical experts who possess the ability to provide input on code interpretation issues, and also have the authority to make project schedule commitments for DSA.

The amount of time saved in the total plan review and approval process by holding preliminary design meetings is dependent upon the size, scope, and complexity of the project and the expertise of the district's design professionals. Design professionals risk delays in the approval process if they misinterpret portions of the building code and submit a completed design to DSA that is based on these misinterpretations. Therefore, a significant time savings to the project is possible as a result of identification and correction of these errors early in the design phase during the preliminary design meetings. If no significant code misinterpretations are identified, then there may not be a significant time savings overall in the process. However, the preliminary design meetings provide districts and their design professionals a set time schedule and the assurance that they are proceeding in the proper direction with their building design, it is code compliant, and the project can be constructed as designed, and within the district's budget.

Districts have embraced the preliminary design meetings and the utilization of these meetings has steadily increased since inception of Phase One of the Collaborative Process. During Phase One implementation, 33 school districts and 29 community college districts participated in 269 preliminary meetings for 172 projects totaling approximately $4.9 billion in estimated construction costs.

The DSA has participated in regularly occurring partnering sessions with numerous K-12 and community college districts to discuss specific project issues and schedules, master planning, staffing issues, processes, and to improve communication between DSA and the districts. These partnering sessions have provided a forum for improved communication and cooperation between key district personnel and DSA. The participating districts include:

- Los Angeles Unified School District
- Los Angeles Community College District
- San Francisco Unified School District
- Rio Hondo Community College District
- San Diego Unified School District
- Sweetwater Unified High School District

DSA Organization and Staffing

The DSA has been able to provide timelier plan review by filling vacant positions and through increased use of consultant plan review firms. Over the past several years, DSA has increased the number of consulting firms to provide additional plan review resources. The number of qualified consultant plan review firms for each discipline in each of the DSA Regional Offices is reflected below.

Chart 2. Number of Qualified Consultant Plan Review Firms

Regional Office	Structural Safety	Fire & Life Safety	Access Compliance
Oakland	28	9	9
Sacramento	32	11	9
Los Angeles	34	7	9
San Diego	33	6	6

Model Timeframe Goals

To assist school and community college district facilities personnel and their design professionals in their planning efforts, model statewide plan review and approval timeframe goals have been developed and placed on the DSA website at http://www.dsa.dgs.ca.gov. The model is intended for use as a planning tool for the scheduling of specific projects and the master planning of district facility programs (Attachment D).

Training for DSA Staff and Plan Review Consultants, Districts, and Design Professionals

AB 162, EC (Section 81133.2), requires that the DGS provide training on an on-going basis to its employees and to the employees of architectural and structural engineering firms that contract with the department for plan review services. The DSA has developed an extensive training program to enhance consistent and complete plan reviews (Attachment E). In 2006, the DSA Academy was established for the development and delivery of technical classes, by discipline, to provide training on the California Building Code as applicable to school and community college construction projects including plan review and construction inspection standards and requirements. Internal DSA plan review staff and consulting plan review staff are required to attend the applicable DSA Academy training courses. Typical academy participants include:

- Design Professionals—learning about code content and interpretations to help them provide more accurate code compliant designs for submittal to DSA
- DSA Staff—to ensure consistency in plan review comments regarding code interpretations and scope of review
- School and Community College District Personnel—on the DSA review and approval process so they can better plan their projects and ensure they meet all requirements

To date, the DSA Academy has provided training to over 3,000 individuals.

Since the inception of the Academy, DSA management has realized overall improvement in the quality of plan review comments from internal and consultant plan review staff. While the impact of the training on plan review timelines has not been quantified, the efficiencies from consistent code-based plan review comments and the reduction in unnecessary comments translate directly into a reduction in the response time of design professionals to DSA plan review comments.

Phase Two Collaborative Process Implementation

Regulations, Policies and Procedures

Formal written policies, processes, and procedures have been developed and encompass the specific steps to implement the provisions described in the Overview of the Collaborative Process beginning on page nine of this report. These more formal policies, processes, and procedures have been implemented for those community college projects with an estimated construction cost exceeding $5 million and wherein the district has voluntarily selected to utilize the Collaborative Process. For K-12 school districts, the procedures established in Phase 1 continue to be utilized. Adoption of regulations specific to the timing for collection of the DSA plan review fees is slated to occur at 2009 year end.

Concurrently, Senate Bill 588, EC Section 81053, (Attachment B) was approved by the Governor in September 2008. The bill required the DSA "to develop and submit, in consultation with the California Community Colleges' Board of Governors, by June 1, 2009, to the California Building Standards Commission proposed building standards for adoption as part of the CBC that will govern the construction, reconstruction, modification, or expansion of community college buildings of a community college district if the community college district elects not to utilize the Field Act." As a result, DSA and the community colleges have collaborated on a review of Title 24's building code provisions for community college projects to ensure that applicable regulations fulfill the seismic performance objectives of the Field Act and to incorporate changes that promote time and cost savings where appropriate. These regulatory changes will be incorporated into the 2010 Title 24 CBC.

Also, a standing committee of the DSA Advisory Board, representing community college interests, has been established to assist in implementing Senate Bill 588 (EC Section 81053), The committee collaborates with DSA on implementing SB 588's alternate process, review for structural code change proposals impacting community colleges, evaluates the need for electrical, mechanical, and plumbing plan review procedures within DSA's plan review program, and addresses other issues as needed.

Tracking and Timeframe Commitments

The DSA has enacted a system and procedures to track mutually agreed upon timeframe commitments to verify whether or not the commitments are being met by DSA, and school and community college districts and their design professionals. Collaborative Process projects of various scopes have been compared to projects of similar scopes and that are not participating in the Collaborative Process. This data has assisted in understanding the potential success of the Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review.

Results

The DSA implemented a system that has tracked projects utilizing the Collaborative Process including the number of days for each project the: 1) DSA spent completing the plan review,

and 2) district/design professional spent in responding to DSA plan review comments, and backchecking the project to receive DSA approval. For the purpose of illustrating results for this report, timeframe goals were tracked beginning July 1, 2008, through March 31, 2009. The following tables summarize the success in meeting scheduled timeframe goals. Twelve (12) school districts and 10 community college districts with 43 projects in all and each exceeding $5 million in estimated construction costs utilized the Collaborative Process during this period. Early results presented in the following tables signify that the use of the Collaborative Process improves performance timeframes for DSA plan review and district/design professional response and backcheck.

Plan review was completed by DSA on 43 projects thus providing quantifiable data for the reporting requirement of AB 162. For 18 of those 43 projects, the district/design professional response to the DSA plan review comments and backcheck completion also had occurred. Twenty-five (25) of those 43 projects are not reportable as the scheduled dates for completion of backcheck had not occurred as of March 31, 2009.

In addition to the results of the 43 projects reported in the following tables, approximately 220 projects have utilized the Collaborative Process between July 1, 2008, and March 31, 2009. These projects are not represented in the tables because insufficient quantifiable data exists to report on timeframe goal success since DSA's established date to complete plan review for these projects has not yet occurred.

Table 1 identifies the cost categories, number of projects completed through DSA plan review, and whether the timeframe goals were met. The results demonstrate that DSA plan review was completed on or prior to the timeframe goal for 67 percent of the projects. The timeframe goal was not met for 33 percent of the projects.

Table 1. Achievement of Timeframe Goals for Collaborative Process Projects that Completed DSA Plan Review Only (July 1, 2008 – March 31, 2009)

Estimated Cost of Project Construction ($)	Collaborative Process Projects Completed at least through DSA Plan Review (# Projects)	DSA Plan Review Complete	
		Met Timeframe Goal (# Projects)	Did Not Meet Timeframe Goal (# Projects)
5 - 10 million	14	10	4
10 - 20 million	18	12	6
20 – 50 million	9	5	4
>50 million	2	2	No reportable projects
Total	43	29[4]	14[4]

[4] 43 total Collaborative Process projects completed at least through DSA plan review phase—29 (67 percent) met timeframe goal, 14 (33 percent) did not meet timeframe goal. Data inclusive of new construction and alterations to existing buildings for K-12 and community college projects exceeding $5 million in estimated construction cost.

Table 2 identifies the cost categories, number of projects completed through DSA plan review, and district/design professional response to DSA plan review comments and backcheck, and whether timeframe goals were met. The results demonstrate that backcheck was completed on or prior to the timeframe goal for 28 percent of the 18 projects. For 72 percent of the 18 projects, the timeframe was not met.

Table 2. Achievement of Timeframe Goals for Collaborative Process Projects that Completed DSA Plan Review, and District/Design Professional Response to DSA Plan Review Comments and Backcheck (July 1, 2008 – March 31, 2009)

Estimated Cost of Project Construction ($)	Collaborative Process Projects Completed through DSA Plan Review, and Response to Plan Review Comments and Backcheck (# Projects)	District/Design Professional Response to DSA Plan Review Comments and Backcheck Complete	
		Met Timeframe Goal (# Projects)	Did Not Meet Timeframe Goal (# Projects)
5 - 10 million	9	3	6
10 - 20 million	8	2	6
20 – 50 million	1	No reportable projects	1
>50 million	No reportable projects	No reportable projects	No reportable projects
Total	18	5 [5]	13[5]

In addition, an analysis has been conducted comparing the average number of days for DSA plan review and district/design professional response to comments and backcheck for projects using the Collaborative Process and projects utilizing the traditional plan review process. Table 3 reflects this analysis. Again, early results demonstrate reductions in timeframes for DSA plan review, and district/design professional response to comments and backcheck.

[5] 18 of 43 total Collaborative Process projects completed through response to DSA plan review comments and backcheck phase—5 (28 percent) met timeframe goal, 13 (72 percent) did not meet timeframe goal. Twenty-six (26) of 43 projects are not reportable as the scheduled timeframe goal (date) for completion of backcheck had not occurred as of March 31, 2009. Data inclusive of new construction and alterations to existing buildings for K-12 and community college projects exceeding $5 million in estimated construction cost.

Table 3. A Comparison of Collaborative Process and Traditional Process Projects: Average Number of Days for DSA Plan Review, and District/Design Professional Response to Comments and Backcheck

Estimated Cost of Project Construction ($)	DSA Plan Review (Average # Days)		District/Design Professional Response to DSA Plan Review Comments and Backcheck (Average # Days)	
	Collaborative Process Projects[6] (43 projects)	Traditional Projects[7] (604 projects)	Collaborative Process Projects[6] (18 projects)	Traditional Projects[7] (515 projects)
5 - 10 million	68	98	62	118
10 - 20 million	85	103	53	127
20 – 50 million	102	118	44	152
>50 million	98	138	No reportable projects	133

To date, district satisfaction with the Collaborative Process is high. Participating districts have reported general adherence with the scheduled timeframes throughout design development, DSA plan review, and district/design professional response to DSA plan review comments and backcheck. These scheduled timeframes have allowed the districts to monitor and hold their design team and DSA accountable for meeting their respective schedule milestones. The design teams are perceived by the districts to have embraced their timeframe milestones seriously.

Attributing to success has been the prepared preliminary design meeting agendas and meeting records that have documented critical design decisions and project schedules. The districts recognize that DSA has attempted to align its plan review resources with the project submittal date thus effectively reducing the time between submittal to DSA and start of project review. Concurrent communication between the district and its design professionals, and DSA plan review staff during the design and plan review phases has resulted in resolution of design issues that would have otherwise prolonged DSA project review and approval.

Los Angeles Unified School District indicated that for projects between $60 million and $130 million in estimated construction cost, the average project timeframe from DSA submittal through
approval has dropped approximately 30 percent. Los Angeles Community College District reported a reduction by as much as 60 percent in the design professional's response time between return of the DSA plan review comments and initiation of backcheck. DSA and the districts are encouraged with the early success of the Collaborative Process.

Through the use of the Collaborative Process and its accompanying preliminary design meetings and the establishment of mutually agreed upon schedules, DSA now has the ability to be more responsive to client needs such as schedules and to provide a proactive response in resolving technical issues with the district and its design professional prior to

[6] Projects submitted and at least plan review completed between July 1, 2008 – March 31, 2009
[7] Projects approved between January 1, 2007 (AB 162 effective date) – March 31, 2009

project submittal. The DSA operations are now more efficient due to the ability to anticipate the timing for project submittals. Due to schedule predictability, resources including plan review staff and consultants are much easier aligned with project review needs resulting in greater adherence to timeframes for project review. The quality and completeness of project submittals from districts/design professionals is of higher quality allowing DSA to address projects more expediently. Fewer errors and omissions in project design by design professionals have resulted in the avoidance of time delays during DSA project intake and plan review.

Attachment A—Excerpt from Assembly Bill 162

Assembly Bill No. 162
CHAPTER 407
An act to amend Sections 17303, 17305, 81133, 81134, and 81135 of, to add Sections 81133.1 and 81133.2 to, and to add Article 3.3 (commencing with Section 17319) to Chapter 3 of Part 10.5 of, the Education Code, relating to school facilities, and making an appropriation therefor.

[Approved by Governor September 22, 2006.
Filed with Secretary of State September 22, 2006.]

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

AB 162, Leslie. School facilities: Department of General Services: California Community Colleges.

Existing law establishes the public school system in this state. Existing law also establishes the California Community Colleges under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Existing law authorizes the establishment of school districts and county offices of education, as well as community college districts, and authorizes these districts to provide instruction at public elementary and secondary schools and community college campuses throughout the state.

Existing law requires the Department of General Services to supervise the design and construction of certain school buildings, including elementary and secondary schools, as well as specified community college facilities, to ensure that plans and specifications comply with specified structural safety standards and to ensure that the work of construction has been performed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications, for the protection of life and property. Existing law also requires the department to pass upon and approve or reject all plans for the construction of, and in some cases, the alteration of, any school building
subject to those provisions, and to inspect the school buildings and work of construction or alteration to an extent that in its judgment is necessary or proper for the enforcement of these requirements and the protection of the safety of the students, the instructors, and the public. Existing law requires the department to take specified action, as necessary, to expedite review of the applicant's plans. These requirements are part of the body of law known as the Field Act.

This bill would require the department, as it deems necessary to expedite review of the applicant's plans, to make a good faith effort to hire state employees. The bill would require the department to establish procedures and requirements governing the use of the collaborative process for project development and review, as an alternative to the traditional plan review and approval process, to ensure the public safety of school buildings serving kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, as well as community college buildings, through a collaborative, consistent, and timely project development and review process. The bill would require the department, in consultation with participating school districts and community college districts, to establish mutually determined timeframe goals for a project's plan review, district and consultant response, response review, and final approval. The bill would require the timeframe goals to reflect

the project's estimated construction cost, complexity, and size, and other requirements of the collaborative process for project development and review.

The bill would require the department to establish model statewide timeframe goals by February 1, 2007, and to submit a preliminary report to the Legislature by July 1, 2008, and a final report by July 1, 2009, that address whether the implementation of the collaborative process for project development and review has assisted the department, the school districts, and the community college districts in meeting their timeframe goals.

The bill would authorize the department to establish a procedure for the payment and collection of a specified filing fee that would be imposed by the department in connection with the submission of an application for the collaborative process for project development and review. The bill would authorize the department to assess a fee on a participating district to cover the unreimbursed costs of the department incurred pursuant to that district's participation in the collaborative process if the department deems the assessment of the fee to be necessary for the support of its operations and establishes a procedure for the determination, payment, and collection of the fee. The bill would authorize the proceeds of the fee to be paid into the State Treasury and credited to the continuously appropriated Public School Planning, Design, and Construction Review Revolving Fund, and thus the bill would make an appropriation.

The bill would establish alternative procedures pursuant to which the department, at its discretion, may advertise and award contracts for a qualified plan review firm for assistance in performing the plan review required by existing law. Under these alternative procedures, the bill would authorize the department to request statements of qualifications from interested plan review firms. The bill would require the department to announce the statements of qualifications through specified means, and would require those statements to describe the general scope of services to be provided within each generic project category for plan review services that the department anticipates may be awarded during the period covered by the announcement. The bill would require the department to evaluate the statements of qualifications and develop a list of qualified firms that meet certain requirements. The bill would require the department to contact firms on a rotational basis to distribute the work in a fair and equitable manner and to determine that the firm has sufficient staff and is available for the performance of the project. Upon selecting a qualified firm, the bill would require the department to negotiate a contract for the services that includes a price and timeframe that it determines to be fair and reasonable.

The bill would also make various nonsubstantive technical and conforming changes.

Appropriation: yes.

The people of the State of California do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(a) Current law requires the Department of General Services to review and approve plans for community college and school buildings serving kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, after the plans are completed by the building designers in accordance with the Field Act.

(b) Because of the increasing complexity of building design, especially seismic requirements, it is costly and time consuming for building designers to change the design of a building after the plans are completed.

(c) Returning plans after review for corrections or redesign can delay the completion and use of the building.

(d) Early collaboration among the Department of General Services, community college districts, school districts, and their design professionals during critical stages of the building design and project development process will facilitate the early identification and resolution of technical issues, and thus reduce the probability that significant changes in the building plans will be required after plan review. The current project submittal and plan review process established by existing law does not formally accommodate, prior to design completion, this desired degree of collaboration and issue resolution between these parties.

(e) The Legislature acknowledges that the Department of General Services and the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges have entered into a memorandum of understanding for the development and implementation of the collaborative process for project development and review to ensure the public safety of community college facilities through a collaborative, consistent, and timely project development and plan review process.

(f) This process may be made available to community college districts and school districts serving kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive, on a voluntary basis, as an alternative to the traditional plan review and approval process currently provided by the Department of General Services. The collaborative process for project development and review involves the early and full participation of all parties involved in the development, plan review, construction, and certification of facilities projects on behalf of community college districts and school districts serving kindergarten and grades 1 to 12, inclusive. These parties include the Department of General Services staff, qualified plan review firms, community college districts, school districts, and their design professionals.

* * *

SEC. 3. Article 3.3 (commencing with Section 17319) is added to Chapter 3 of Part 10.5 of the Education Code, to read:

Article 3.3. Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review

17319. (a) The Legislature finds and declares all of the following:

(1) The purpose of the collaborative process for project development and review is to ensure the public safety of school facilities through a collaborative, consistent, and timely project development and review process.

(2) The collaborative process for project development and review may be made available, as an alternative to the traditional plan review and approval process, to school districts that voluntarily apply to the Department of General Services.

(3) This process entails the early participation of all parties involved in a project from project development and continuing through plan review, construction, and certification of school facilities projects. These parties include the Department of General Services' staff and their qualified plan review firms, and school districts and their design professionals.

(b) The Department of General Services, in consultation with the Office of Public School Construction, shall establish procedures and requirements governing the use of the collaborative process for project development and review alternative. These procedures and requirements shall include an application and selection process. Upon project selection, the Department of General Services and the school district shall mutually agree to the roles and responsibilities of the Department of General Services, the applicant school district, and its design professionals.

(c) As a part of the establishment of the requirements for the collaborative process for project development and review, the Department of General Services, in consultation with participating school districts, shall establish mutually determined timeframe goals for a project's plan review, district and consultant response, response review, and final approval. Those timeframe goals shall reflect the project's estimated construction cost, complexity, size, and other requirements of the collaborative process for project development and review.

(d) The Department of General Services shall establish model statewide timeframe goals, in consultation with school districts and other relevant parties, by February 1, 2007. Implementation of the collaborative process for project development and review with participating districts shall not negatively impact the traditional plan review process with other districts.

(e) The Department of General Services shall submit a preliminary report to the Legislature by July 1, 2008, and a final report by July 1, 2009. These reports shall address whether the implementation of the collaborative process for project development and review has assisted the department and school districts in meeting their mutually determined timeframe goals.

(f) Notwithstanding Section 17300, the application for the collaborative process for project development and review may be accompanied by a filing fee from the school district in amounts determined by the Department of General Services based on the estimated project cost and according to the fee schedule identified in subdivisions (a) to (c), inclusive, of Section 17300. The Department of General Services may establish a procedure for the payment and collection of this filing fee.

(g) The department may assess a fee on a participating district to cover the unreimbursed costs of the department incurred pursuant to that district's participation in the collaborative process if the department deems the assessment of the fee to be

necessary for the support of its operations and establishes a procedure for the determination, collection, and deposit of the fee.

(h) During project development, the school district may provide input to the Department of General Services in its selection of a qualified plan review firm to provide consultative services to that department. Upon project submittal by the applicant school district, the department shall also refer the necessary project documents to the selected qualified plan review firm for plan review. The department shall establish procedures governing the use of this article by applicant school districts for the selection of a qualified plan review firm.

* * *

SEC. 6. Section 81133.2 is added to the Education Code, to read:

81133.2. (a) The Department of General Services shall provide training, on an ongoing basis, to its employees and to the employees of architectural and structural engineering firms that contract with the department for the purposes of this chapter. The training shall address all phases of the plan review process established under this chapter, and shall be designed to ensure that all individuals who develop and review college building plans obtain sufficient knowledge of the rules, regulations, and standards that apply under this chapter.

(b) The department shall make the training described in subdivision (a) available to the employees of architectural and structural engineering firms that contract with applicant community college districts for the purpose of this chapter, and to any other individuals, firms, and governmental agencies that are involved in college building design, construction, or inspection, and that may benefit from the training.

(c) The department may charge a fee for training provided pursuant to this subdivision.

SEC. 6.5. Section 81134 of the Education Code is amended to read:

81134. (a) The Department of General Services shall establish one or more methods to ensure that each application has been completed sufficiently by the applicant to enable the plan review to be performed.

(b) Upon receipt of a complete application, the Department of General Services shall inform the applicant of the period of time that it anticipates to elapse prior to commencing review of the applicant's plans. Within 10 days of being so notified, the applicant shall make an election to either use the Department of General Services for the review of the applicant's plans or, request that the plan review be performed by one or more qualified plan review firms pursuant to Sections 81135 and 81136. If the applicant elects to use the services of the Department of General Services for review of the applicant's plans, the department, as it deems necessary to expedite review of the applicant's plans, in addition to making a good faith effort to hire state employees, shall do one or more of the following:

(1) Contract for assistance from one or more qualified plan review firms pursuant to Sections 81135 and 81136.

(2) Employ additional staff on a temporary basis.

(3) Maximize the use of department staff through the use of overtime or other appropriate means.

(4) Any other action determined by the department to have the effect of expediting the review and approval process.

(c) Each application shall identify, for purposes of receiving the notifications required under this subdivision, an employee of the applicant community college district and either the applicant's architect or structural engineer. The Department of General Services immediately shall notify that employee, and the identified architect or structural engineer, when each of the following steps in the plan review process occurs:

(1) The department requests the applicant's architect or structural engineer to correct or complete any part of the application.

(2) An application number is assigned to the application.

(3) Review of the applicant's plans is commenced.

(4) Review of the applicant's plans is completed and the department returns the plans to the architect or structural engineer for correction.

(5) Corrected plans are returned to the department by the applicant's architect or structural engineer for final review and approval.

(6) The department approves the plans and causes a final record set of the plans to be printed in accordance with Section 17304.

(d) The Department of General Services may provide additional notifications to applicants as it deems necessary.

SEC. 7. Section 81135 of the Education Code is amended to read:

81135. (a) Unless the context otherwise requires, the definitions set forth in this section govern the construction of this article.

(1) "Prequalified list" means a list of qualified firms established by the Department of General Services to perform specific types of plan review services.
(2) "Qualified plan review firm" means an individual, firm, or the building official of a city, county, or city and county, as defined in Section 18949.27 of the Health and Safety Code, or the authorized representative of that building official that is identified by the Department of General Services as having appropriate expertise and knowledge of the requirements that apply to school buildings under this article.

(b) The department shall establish and maintain a list of qualified plan review firms, and shall make that list available, upon request, to community college districts and other interested parties.

(c) Notwithstanding Section 14952 of the Government Code, the Department of General Services shall contract with sufficient numbers of qualified plan review firms for assistance in performing the plan review required under the Field Act.

(d) At the discretion of the Department of General Services, contracts for a qualified plan review firm made pursuant to this article may be advertised and awarded in accordance with this section.

(e) (1) The Department of General Services may establish prequalified lists of qualified firms in accordance with this subdivision.

(2) (A) For each type of plan review for which the department elects to use the process established by this section for advertising and awarding contracts, the Department of General Services may request statements of qualifications from interested firms.

(B) The request for statements of qualifications shall be announced statewide through the California State Contracts Register and publications of relevant professional societies.

(C) Each announcement shall describe the general scope of services to be provided within each generic project category for plan review services that the Department of General Services anticipates may be awarded during the period covered by the announcement. For the purposes of this section, a generic project category shall be defined in a manner that each specific project to be awarded within a respective discipline meets all of the following requirements:

(i) The project is substantially similar to all other projects within that discipline.

(ii) The project is within the same size range and geographical area.

(iii) The project requires substantially similar skills and magnitude of professional effort as compared to every other project within that discipline.

(3) The Department of General Services shall evaluate the statements of qualifications, and develop a list of qualified plan review firms that meet the criteria established and published by the Department of General Services. Interviews may be held to determine a firm's qualifications. Lists of qualified plan review firms shall be maintained by the Department of General Services for not more than four years.

(4) During the term of a prequalified list, as specific projects are identified by the Department of General Services as being eligible for contracting, the Department of General Services shall contact a firm on the prequalified list, on a rotational basis, for both of the following purposes:

(A) To distribute the work in a fair and equitable manner.

(B) To determine that the firm has sufficient staff and is available for performance of the project.

(5) If the contacted firm is not available, the Department of General Services shall continue to contact firms on the prequalified list, on a rotational basis, until an available firm is identified.

(6) The Department of General Services shall negotiate a contract for the services with the identified firm, including a price and timeframe that it determines is fair and reasonable.

(7) If the identified plan review firm is unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with the Department of General Services, the department shall terminate negotiations, and shall undertake negotiations, on a rotational basis, with the next firm available for performance from the prequalified list until a successful negotiation is achieved. If the Department of General Services is unable to negotiate a satisfactory contract with a firm on two separate occasions, that firm may be removed from the prequalified list.

(f) Contracts for plan review services that the Department of General Services elects to advertise and award in accordance with this section are not subject to Chapter 10 (commencing with Section 4525) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code.

Attachment B—Senate Bill 588

Senate Bill No. SB 588
CHAPTER 704

An act to add Sections 81053 and 81054 to the Education Code,
relating to community colleges.
(FILED WITH SECRETARY OF STATE SEPTEMBER 30, 2008.
APPROVED BY GOVERNOR SEPTEMBER 30, 2008.)

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL'S DIGEST

SB 588, Runner. Postsecondary education: community college school buildings.

Existing law establishes the California Community Colleges under the administration of the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges. Existing law authorizes the establishment of community college districts under the administration of community college governing boards, and authorizes these districts to provide instruction at community college campuses throughout the state.

Existing law requires the Department of General Services (department) to supervise the design and construction of certain school buildings, including specified community college facilities, to ensure that plans and specifications comply with specified structural safety standards and to ensure that the work of construction has been performed in accordance with the approved plans and specifications, for the protection of life and property. Existing law also requires the department to pass upon and approve or reject all plans for the construction of, and in some cases, the alteration of, any school building subject to those provisions, and to inspect the school buildings and work of construction or alteration that in its judgment is necessary or proper for the enforcement of these requirements and the protection of the safety of the students, the instructors, and the public. These requirements are part of the body of law known as the Field Act.

Existing law requires school buildings that are constructed, reconstructed, modified, or expanded after July 1, 2006, on a community college campus to be built according to the Field Act or according to the California Building Standards Code, as adopted by the California Building Standards Commission.

This bill would require the department to develop and submit, in consultation with the board of governors, by June 1, 2009, to the California Building Standards Commission proposed building standards for adoption as part of the California Building Standards Code that will govern the construction, reconstruction, modification, or expansion of school buildings of a community college district, if the community college district elects not to utilize the Field Act. The department would be required to review and include, where appropriate, in these standards the standards that govern the California State University.

The bill would require the Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) to undertake a fact-based analysis of the length of time the department and the community colleges take to perform their respective functions to complete community college construction and alteration projects, and compile this information in a report. The bill would require the

Department of General Services to convene a working group to analyze the report and the current process to complete community college construction and alteration projects and develop recommendations for changes, if any, in the project development and review process to ensure the public safety of community college facilities through a collaborative, consistent, cost-effective, and timely project development and review process.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS:

SECTION 1. It is the intent of the Legislature that:

(a) This act ensure the construction of community college facilities in a safe, cost-effective, and timely manner.

(b) The Department of General Services be staffed appropriately to perform the tasks assigned to it, including plan review and oversight, to ensure the timely, cost-effective, and safe delivery of community college facilities.

(c) The process created pursuant to this act be implemented in a manner to ensure that community college districts realize time and cost savings in the construction process while meeting the same seismic safety performance levels as the Field Act.

SEC. 2. Section 81053 is added to the Education Code, to read:

81053. (a) To ensure that community college districts are able to effectively exercise the option of utilizing the Field Act or the California Building Standards Code, as provided in Section 81052, and construct buildings safely, cost effectively, and in a timely manner, the Department of General Services shall develop and submit, in consultation with the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, by June 1, 2009, to the California Building Standards Commission proposed building standards for adoption as part of the California Building Standards Code that will govern the construction, reconstruction, modification, or expansion of school buildings of a community college district as provided in Section 81052, if the community college district elects not to utilize the Field Act. The Department of General Services shall review and include, where appropriate, in these standards the standards that govern the California State University. The proposed building standards shall provide for independent plan review and oversight to be performed by the Department of General Services. The standards shall become effective 30 days after adoption by the California Building Standards Commission.

(b) The Department of General Services shall be responsible for plan reviews consistent with Section 81133.

SEC. 3. Section 81054 is added to the Education Code, to read:

81054. (a) The Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO) shall undertake a fact-based analysis of the length of time the Department of General Services and the community colleges take to perform their respective functions to complete community college construction and alteration projects. This information shall be compiled in a report made available to the Legislature and the Governor by March 1, 2009.

(b) Following the issuance of the report described in subdivision (a), the Department of General Services shall convene a working group advisory committee consisting of a representative from the Department of General Services, the Board of Governors of the California Community Colleges, the Associated General Contractors of California, and the Professional Engineers in California Government. The working group shall analyze the report and the current process to complete community college

construction and alteration projects and develop recommendations for changes, if any, in the project development and review process to ensure the public safety of community college facilities through a collaborative, consistent, cost-effective, and timely project development and review process. The recommendations shall include proposed timeframe goals for the performance of each specific task performed by the Department of General Services and by private design professionals performing services for a community college district and an assessment of the staffing and other resource needs of the Department of General Services to perform its tasks related to the construction or alteration of community college facilities. The recommendations shall be submitted in writing to the Department of General Services, working group members, the Senate and Assembly Committees on Appropriations, the Senate Committee on Education, the Assembly Committee on Higher Education, and the education budget subcommittees of the Assembly and Senate by December 31, 2009.

Attachment C—Collaborative Process Implementation Letter

State of California • Arnold Schwarzenegger, Governor
State and Consumer Services Agency
DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES
Division of the State Architect - Headquarters

November 3, 2006

To: California Community College Chief Business Officers and Facilities Planners

From: David Thorman, State Architect

Subject: COLLABORATIVE PROCESS FOR PROJECT DEVELOPMENT AND REVIEW—Procedure for DSA Preliminary Review Meetings and Project Scheduling

Beginning January 2007, the Division of the State Architect (DSA) is implementing the initial phase of the Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review. When fully implemented, the purpose of this collaborative process is to ensure the public safety of community college and K-12 school facilities through the implementation of a collaborative, consistent and timely project development and review process.

During this initial phase of implementation, the procedure for DSA preliminary review meetings and project scheduling described below is being offered by the DSA to community college districts for projects with construction costs exceeding $5 million and wherein a project's design development will be initiated after January 1, 2007. The use of this procedure by your district is voluntary.

The purpose of DSA preliminary review meetings prior to DSA project submittal is two-fold. First, the meeting provides a forum to ensure that all parties—DSA, and the community college district and its design professionals—involved in the design and review of a project have a mutual understanding of the requirements for successful DSA project intake and plan review. Second, the meeting affords an opportunity to coordinate schedules for DSA project submittal and plan review completion.

If your district elects to utilize the procedure for DSA preliminary review meetings and project scheduling, the following is required:

A. DSA Notification of District Participation

- Prior to initiation of design development, the district must notify the regional manager in its respective DSA regional office of its intent to utilize the DSA preliminary review meeting and project scheduling procedure.

B. DSA Preliminary Review Meetings

- Two preliminary review meetings conducted prior to DSA project submittal are required:
  1) Immediately prior to the initiation of design development, and
  2) At 75% construction documents completion
- The purpose of the DSA preliminary review meetings is to identify and resolve technical issues and coordinate DSA project submittal and plan review timeframes and schedules.
- Both the district representative and its key design professionals shall participate in all DSA preliminary review meetings conducted with the DSA[1]. Five working days prior to each

preliminary review meeting, the district and its design professionals shall submit a meeting agenda to DSA addressing areas of discussion (e.g., meeting objectives and desired outcomes, specific technical issues, project schedules, expectations). Additionally, within 10 working days following each DSA preliminary review meeting, the district and its design professionals shall prepare and distribute to all meeting participants, a written meeting record that captures key discussion points and agreements resulting from the meeting.

C. Project Scheduling

- At the initial preliminary review meeting conducted prior to initiation of design development, the DSA and the district and its design professionals shall review the overall project schedule including key milestones.
- At the DSA preliminary review meeting conducted at 75% construction document completion, the DSA and the district and its design professionals shall schedule a specific date for DSA project submittal.
- If the agreed upon DSA project submittal date is met by the district and its design professionals and the submittal is deemed 100% complete by DSA, the project will proceed into DSA plan review and the plan review will be completed by DSA on the committed date.

If beginning January 1, 2007, your district elects to utilize this procedure on a project-specific basis, please contact the regional manager of your local DSA regional office.

AB 162 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 2006), effective January 2007, authorizes the DSA to begin implementation of the Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review. In summary, this collaborative process provides, on a voluntary basis, the opportunity for community college districts to initiate work with the DSA during the preliminary stages of a project's development and continue that collaboration through the project's plan review and approval.

Currently, the DSA is securing a contractor to facilitate the development of the items (e.g., policies, procedures, systems, tools, processes, plans) needed for the successful and complete implementation of the Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review. It is anticipated that the implementation of this collaborative process will be initiated during 2007.

Attachment D—Model Timeframe Goals

How long will it take? Estimating Plan Review Time

The estimated plan review time generated by using this calculator is only intended for use as a planning tool when scheduling school construction projects. This estimated review time, *in calendar days*, may not apply in all cases. *Contact a DSA Regional Office if a more detailed estimate is desired*. DSA will monitor the accuracy of this calculator and make changes to reflect actual results.

Plan Review Time Calculator [1] [2]

Size ($ million)	**<1**	**1-5**	**6-10**	**11-12**	**>21-60**[3]
A. Intake [4]	30 days	35 days	35 days	35 days	35 days
B. New buildings (actual time to review – structural review takes the most time)	7 days	7-30 days	31-60 days	61-80 days	81 days + 2 days /$1mil
C. Modernization [5] **(access compliance may take the most time for review)**	7 days	14 days	21 days	28 days	28 days
D. Complexity	Increase the review time (B. or C. above) by up to 50% for complex projects, i.e. - unusual structural systems, curved walls, irregular structures, schools built on steep slopes, seismic retrofit				
E. Reuse	Reduce the review time (B. above) based on how many individual buildings within a project are *exactly* the same as previously approved plans or repeat on the same project. i.e. – a project that has 10 buildings, with 3 identical buildings, will have a 20% savings in review time since only 8 building designs will need to be reviewed.				
F. Number of Buildings	A large building takes less time to review than several small buildings. Subtract up to 20% for one/two large buildings or add up to 20% for several small buildings to the review time (B. above) based on number of buildings.				
G. Architect/Engineer (A/E) Response to Plan Review Comments [6]	One to six months – dependent on architect/engineer (A/E) response. Experience is that few projects are returned for back-check in less than 30 days. Projects can be voided if back-check doesn't start within six months of when the check-set was returned to the A/E for corrections.				
H. Back-check New [6] [7]	2 days	5 days	10 days	15 days	30 days
I. Back-check Modernization [5] [6] [7]	2 days	2 days	2 days	3 days	5 days

Footnotes

[1] Days indicated are *calendar days*.

[2] Preliminary meetings, especially for large or complex projects, are suggested at which the specific details of a project can be considered and a schedule discussed and agreed upon.

[3] The DSA Regional Office should always be contacted for determining review times for projects over $60 million in construction cost.

[4] Intake time will increase if incomplete drawings are submitted. Plan review will not begin until a complete submittal is received.

[5] These times do not apply to rehabilitation projects. Preliminary meetings are strongly encouraged for rehabilitation projects.

[6] Quality of the design, responsiveness of the A/E to the comments and level of preparation for back-check can significantly affect the schedule. The values shown are based on reasonable performance.

[7] Upon receipt of the stamped file copies of the plans and specifications, DSA shall issue a letter approving the application. This letter constitutes the "written approval, as to the safety of design and construction" required by sections 17297 and 81134, Education Code, before any valid contract for construction may be made or executed.

Sample Project (1) Modernization

Given:

- $5 million construction cost
- steeply sloping site
- complete submittal
- 1 month turn-around

Calculation: Project (1) Modernization

A. Intake	35 days
C. Modernization	14 days
D. Complexity (+10%C)	1.4 days
G. A/E Response	30 days
I. Backcheck	2 days
EST. TOTAL	**82 days**

Sample Project (2) New

Given:

- $20 million middle school
- regular type buildings
- three classroom wings (30% of the project) exactly the same
- complete submittal
- 1 month turn-around

Calculation: Project (2) New

A. Intake	35 days
B. New - Review	80 days
E. Reuse (-20% B)	-16 days
G. A/E Response	30 days
I. Backcheck	15 days
EST. TOTAL	**144 days**

Sample Project (3) New

Given:

- $20 million middle school
- complex structural design
- many small buildings
- incomplete submittal causing 14 day delay
- 2 month turn-around

Calculation: Project (3) New

A. Intake + 14 days	49 days
B. New - Review	80 days
D. Complexity (+10% B)	8 days
F. # of Bldgs. (+15% B)	12 days
G. A/E Response	61 days
I. Backcheck	15 days
EST. TOTAL	**225 days**

Attachment E—Required Training Courses for DSA and Consultant Plan Review Staff

Structural Safety

DSA Academy Courses

- Plan Review – Structural (2007 CBC)
- 2007 CBC Amendments - Structural Safety

Training from External Providers

- Transitioning to the 2007 CBC
- Design Steel Your Way with the 2005 AISC Specification
- 2005 AISC Seismic Provisions and Seismic Design Manual Seminar
- Designing Masonry to the 2005 MSJC Code and Specification
- Wood Design to 2007 CBC
- Concrete Design to the ACI-318

Fire and Life Safety

DSA Academy Course

- Plan Review – Fire & Life Safety Process and Procedures (2007 CBC)

Training from External Providers

- Transition from the 1997 UBC to the 2006 IBC
- 2006 IFC Transition from the 2000 UFC
- 2006 Fundamentals Nonstructural Provisions
- 2006 IBC Solving Means of Egress in Commercial Buildings
- 2006 IBC Special Uses & Mixed Occupancies
- 2006 IBC Hazardous Materials
- 2006 IFC Fundamentals
- 2006 IBC Performing Nonstructural Plan Review
- Fire Pumps for Fire Protection
- Standpipe Systems for Fire Protection
- Fire Sprinkler Plan Review Policies and Procedures
- Underground Piping for Fire Protection Systems
- Hydraulics for Fire Protection
- Overview of NFPA 13 (2002) and Introduction to Plan Review
- 2002 NFPA 72
- Understanding Fire Alarms in the 2006 IBC

Access Compliance

DSA Academy Courses

- Plan Review – Access (2007 CBC)
- 2007 CBC Amendments – Accessibility

Customer Service and Communication

- Conducted 2007-08 in all DSA regional offices and headquarters

Attachment F—Glossary of Terms

Backcheck—upon completion of the plan review by DSA, the project design professional prepares responses to the plan review comments and schedules a backcheck appointment with DSA plan reviewers. This face-to-face backcheck meeting is conducted between the district and its project design professional and DSA plan reviewers to resolve all plan review comments. Depending upon the significance and number of plan review comments, the plan review and backcheck steps may require several cycles to resolve all comments.

California Building Code (CBC)—in general, buildings constructed according to the CBC that are designed to withstand an earthquake to allow the occupants to exit safely.

Collaborative Process for Project Development and Review—established through AB 162 (Chapter 407, Statutes of 2006) to ensure the public safety of K-12 and community college facilities through a collaborative, consistent, and timely project development and review process. A key element of this process is involvement of DSA, and the district and its design professionals during the earliest stages of a project's development (prior to completing the project design and submitting to DSA for plan review) to reach agreements on design concepts, code interpretations, and project schedules.

Design Professional—primarily architects (principal and project), structural engineers, and geotechnical engineers

District—a public K-12 school district or community college district.

Division of the State Architect (DSA)—the DSA approves the design and supervises construction of K-12 and community college buildings to ensure that facilities are safe and accessible. The DSA reviews construction plans for structural safety, fire and life safety, and access compliance to verify project plans meet the requirements of the California Building Code and provides construction oversight to these projects to ensure they are built in accordance with the approved plans.

DSA Plan Review Consultant—the DSA contracts with qualified plan review firms to augment DSA staff in order to ensure adequate plan review resources are available to provide timely plan review during periods of high workload volumes.

Field Act—the Field Act requires the DSA to review construction plans for K-12 public school and community college buildings, and requires districts to hire onsite construction inspectors to ensure compliance with structural safety standards. Buildings constructed to Field Act standards are designed to withstand an earthquake so that the occupants may exit safely and for the building to remain usable.

Plan Review—the DSA reviews construction plans for structural safety, fire and life safety, and access compliance to verify project plans meet the requirements of the California Building Code.

Preliminary Design Meeting—meetings between DSA staff, and district staff and their design professionals occurring at set intervals during a project's design and development to facilitate increased accountability and process efficiencies. All parties agree on design concepts, code interpretations, and project schedules during the earliest stages of a project's development to ensure projects are more complete and code compliant at DSA submittal and therefore less likely to need further revisions and corrections prior to receiving DSA approval.

Project Approval—upon resolution of all comments by the district and its design professional, project plans and specifications are stamped and approved by DSA.

Timeframe Goal—mutually agreed upon timeframe agreements made between DSA and the district and its design professional for 1) project submittal; 2) return of DSA plan review results to the design team for corrections; and 3) initiation of the project backcheck and project approval.

Traditional Plan Review Process—under the provisions of the Education Code and Title 24 Regulations, DSA conducts thorough plan review of project plans and specifications typically after the design of the project has been completed and submitted to DSA by the project design professional.